

NATIONAL REVIEW

20 Cents

February 2, 1957

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

What Is the Republic?

RUSSELL KIRK

"New Ideas" or Old Truth

FRANK S. MEYER

Budgetary Elephantiasis

L. BRENT BOZEIL

This document is part of an integrated
file. If separated from this file it must be
subjected to individual systematic review.

Articles and Reviews by · · · · · WILLMOORE KENDALL
WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM · E. V. KUEHNELT-LEDDIH
SAM M. JONES · ABE KALISH · BEN RAY REDMAN

PAGES _____

DATE 12-01-97

JOB ~~78-01416~~ 78-01416R / BOX (02)

Folder # 8

Fon # _____

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

BEST COPY

NEXT 3 PAGES

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR AND PUBLISHER: Wm. F. Buckley Jr.

EDITORS

L. Brent Bozell James Burnham
 John Chamberlain Willmoore Kendall
 Guy Le Follette William S. Schlamm
 PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood
 WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES

Priscilla L. Buckley Frank S. Meyer
 Jonathan Mitchell Morrie Ryskind

CONTRIBUTORS

C. D. Batchelor, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John
 Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman,
 Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreutner,
 J. B. Matthews, Gernhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver,
 E. Merrill Root, Freda Utley, Richard M. Weaver,
 Gen. Charles A. Willoughby

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

Genoa: Wilhelm Pöhlke Madrid: J. Der
 Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddin

BUSINESS MANAGER: Theodore A. Driscoll

Contents

FEBRUARY 9, 1957 VOL. III, NO. 5

THE WEEK

ARTICLES

- "New Ideas" and Truth Frank S. Meyer 107
 What Is the Republic? Russell Kirk 111
 The First "R" Abe Kalish 114

DEPARTMENTS

- For the Record L. Brent Bozell 103
 National Trend Sam M. Jones 106
 From Washington, Straight Willmoore Kendall 109
 The Liberal Line William S. Schlamm 115
 Letter from Paris E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddin 110
 Arts and Manners William S. Schlamm 115
 To the Editor 119

BOOKS IN REVIEW

- Spurious as Steel Teeth Willmoore Kendall 116
 Many Poets and One Robert Phelps 117
 Behind the Screen Ben Ray Redman 118
 Reviewed in Brief Frank S. Meyer 118

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly, except second and third
 years in Aug. at Orange, Conn., by National Weekly, Inc. Copyright
 1957 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc. Second-class
 mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:

211 East 37th St.
 New York 16, N.Y.
 Telephone Murray Hill 2-9941

PRICES: Twenty cents a copy, \$2.00 a year, \$13.00 for two years.
 Foreign, \$one a year. Canada, \$8.00 a year.
 Note: The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless
 return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed.
 Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the
 views of the editors.

CPYRGHT The WEEK

* It all began in the Summit Conference at Geneva, in the sunny days of 1955, at which it was resolved, one by one, to settle outstanding problems between East and West. Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson was detailed the minor chore of negotiating with Wang Ping-nan of Peiping the release of ten American civilians being illegally held in Red Chinese jails. Ambassador Johnson went to work immediately. Last week he announced that he has scheduled another conference for February 14—his 65th—and that reminded us that the time has come to urge our readers to send him a Second Annual Postcard (care of U.S. Embassy, Geneva)—we urged our readers to send the first a year ago—telling him never to let the Alexis! You've got to give the spirit of Geneva a chance!

* Senators Lehman and Douglas appear to be keenly aware of the same thing. NATIONAL REVIEW has been maintaining for several months—that in the next four years the serious political battles will not be between Republicans and Democrats but between Republicans and Republicans, and Democrats and Democrats. Senator Lehman, retired and but not very happy about it, accuses the Democrats of following a politically suicidal course. True, reaching for party unity, it failed to press substantive civil rights legislation. He recommends that the new, self-constituted National Advisory Committee bypass congressional Democratic leaders by calling an annual convention, open to all Liberals. In which the paths of righteousness would be publicly illuminated. Senator Douglas was less oblique; instead of suggesting means of circumnavigating conservatives, he simply proposed to leave the Democratic Party. Where would they go?

* Buried beneath the Budget Message's mountains of words was a sentence that should be more conspicuously framed: "Legislation is recommended to authorize the TVA . . . to finance new generating facilities by the sale of revenue bonds." That is: "To . . . for the purpose of building new steam plants that private enterprise could and would eagerly construct if permitted to do so, is going to sell its own bonds to the public, outside of the regular structure of the national debt. The President has in the past declared his belief in the doctrine that government should do what the people cannot or will not do for themselves.

called the Princeton Panel, an organization which devotes its resources to the creation of a ready-to-use library of American capital and "To tell the surviving truth is that the word 'capital' is used in Mr. **CPYRGHT** prospective without the slightest hint of apology." Mr. Robinson believes positively that "capital" is a good system, or better than any of the current alternatives of collectivism that goes by the name of "democratic socialism" or the "middle way" or the "third way." Is Mr. Robinson's unblushing belief in capitalist expansion has caused him to use a dirty word?

* That native Washington institution, The Cocktail Party, as declassé, our Society Editor informs us. This is the year of the well-arranged dinner. To break bread with the so-called Republicans one must now make sure of a place at the table with the so-called Democrats, who should not now be associated with the so-called Republicans. Mr. Averell Harriman himself, in his new book, *How to Win a President*, has this to say: "all about the 'Very Good' place, which is taken up, always after dinner. We do it twice a year, about 2000 guests, and we spend 150,000 on the place, as though the steward had dragged us out from the highway and the byway, which New York politicians do not dare to do, where old Republicans used to spend their time."

Having It Both Ways

In the State of the Union message President Kennedy came out strongly in favor of cutting. This is one of the first White House budgets, costing a \$72 billion deficit. The last, as Mr. Gandy replies in *Newsweek*, was in 1952, a total of \$84 billion. Hence \$12 billion more than the \$68 billion deficit of the year before. The total for 1955, of course, is even larger, especially if 1956 is included, as it should be. (See Table 1, p. 156.)

Mr. Gandy, however, the President's White House budget, and the one before, in \$12 billion, shows a deficit of \$12 billion, or thereabouts, before the so-called "cutting" below.

He might add, however, something about his own style. He is unique in his lack of technicality, and in the fact that his "cutting" can be inferred to consist in what it would take only a slight fall-off in the national income, or the Gross National Product, to cover. He might, however, what the government spends is \$12 billion, and what it will take to cover the deficit, the time may come under big budget-cutting agreements, to strain the taxpayer in his now rapidly increased efforts, that is, to not only meet the deficit, but to reduce it.

As a way of this, many Congressmen, and as might the public, when an objector to a budget, be remarked, "What do you think about your 'British'?" If that is the way Mr. Humphrey feels,

he will resign. But not before calling the attention to his 1952 Republican campaign promise to cut federal spending to something like \$50 billion within four years."

Which End of the Telescope?

A revision in the estimates of the size of Soviet economic growth seems to be under way in both Washington and a number of the civilian research centers. This is a matter of more than abstract importance. American foreign policy is based, to a considerable degree, on the estimates of Soviet military and economic power.

In the past Soviet economic man has been painted on feet high. There have, of course, been fractional differences of opinion among the government and academic economists, but there has been general agreement on the broad dimensions of Soviet economic power.

This agreement no longer prevails. At the convention of the American Economic Association during the Christmas holidays, Professor Walter Nutter of the University of Virginia announced that the rate of Soviet economic growth was below that of the United States. This view will not, I, friendly reception from professional economists, if for no other reason than that Dr. Nutter's inquiries are being sponsored by the respected and wealthy National Bureau of Economic Research.

There is, accordingly, some prospect that the gross errors of estimate that have been made over the past two decades may be corrected in the years to come. This will create quite a flattening in Washington's bureaucratic butchery--especially in the Central Intelligence Agency, which has a very large number of citizens working on this problem who have come to conclusions altogether different from Dr. Nutter's. See, in this point, clearly those who have CIA Director Allen W. Dulles with him. He, too, has been guilty of some of his more serious errors, will have to seek a new source. Mr. Richard Bissell, who fortunately retired from CIA to CIA after the 1952 election returns came in, may be one of them.

Political review, which has always taken a somewhat skeptical view of the Garouedian theory of the Soviet economy, regards the evidence of scientific progress. For one of our early issues we managed to obtain an estimate of Soviet economic capability that was within the bounds of reason. (See *Massachusetts*, lettered by Professor Jan H. T. G. H. It might be well, however, for the American periodical press to re-examine its performance on this question, and perhaps to correct the impression that it has so assiduously propagated for twenty years.

units of social existence. The prescriptive in question was not compounded out of superstition or malice, but out of highly developed notions as to the essential integrity of the family and out of a humanitarian concern over the victimization of innocent children and out of highly practical ideas as to the social utility of monogamy.

A society has no way of defending its institutions when they are violated in extraneous ways, except through the imposition of social sanctions against the violator or the withholding from him of honor, respect or a sense of vindictiveness or pridefulness. In this instance, is it not wise to protest the appearance of Miss Gorman? She can do so in order to vindicate her spirit for the sake of the life she made light of. And, for those who, like us, have been ravaged by the "moral" violators, and solidarity with the "moral" violators who Mr. Allard, in his "moral" judgment, affirms, he would disown the validity of the marriage contract.

Did CIA Take the Senate?

Mr. W. J. Allard has recently published a book, *The CIA and the Senate: The CIA in an Effective Foreign Policy*, in which he presents the aims of the "Special Committee of the Presidential Center for International Studies" at the Columbia University. "Technically, CIA misinterpreted various" already known CIA policies, he says, "and a word of further pessimism is indicated today in Washington over the last year's CIA policy of anti-Revolutionary teams for South America and its desire to give undivided support to the 'right' of progress" (without reference to the "left" of progress). "The CIA strategy is to be a 'soft' CIA, and not be a 'soft' CIA, and to be a 'soft' CIA, and to be a 'soft' CIA."

The Foreign Affairs Committee of the US Senate has been trying to force a stand on CIA policy for the last year, and Allard suggests "mystery number One" (i.e., how could all the scandals mentioned by Allard have been written up without CIA's knowledge?) could be turned out in a single sentence: "A CIA black could have turned out in a single sentence a thousand dollar alibi, could have turned out in a CIA digital computer, cut and pasted it, and been pasted."

But the story should not end more or less as the CIA's Foreign Affairs Stand, a word, "to get into the Senate, to jump and to land for the next part" of the Central Intelligence Agency through the "soft" violence of "soft-out". Unless this is over in time, we have the following prediction:

1. CIA's budget is fixed to CIA - CIA, defining CIA's budget problems. 2. CIA cannot be within the budget, so uses some of the funds to create a

domestic research institution, the MIT Center, and the Center regularly publishes slanted books and articles, advocating particular policies for the U.S. market. 3) The Center, rating itself forward as a bona fide scientific outfit, asks a Senate committee to give it further funds with which to conduct a study of major aid problems. 4) the Senate Committee agrees to. The MIT Center obliges with a propaganda brochure.

Chairmen of the Foreign Relations Committee, it would seem as if you have been conned. Why not a few pertinent questions to Professors Max Millikan and W. W. Rostow, who authored the brochure, and to their backers?

The Barrel's Bottom

Columbia University has created a "special faculty council" to study the "problems facing society as a result of the development of atomic energy"; and the press release accompanying the announcement shows how well the project is in good hands and that a lot of hard thinking has gone into the devising of it. One member of the council, for instance, is our old friend, Dr. Frank Jessup, who demonstrated his capacity to go deeply into difficult problems way back in IPR days. Besides which such distinguished academic disciplines as International Relations, Journalism and Business—along with interests like Physics, Engineering, Medicine, Philosophy and Law—are to be represented in its sessions.

We are going to proclaim Dr. Jessup with his uncanny gift of orature, "to study this atomic age like one of the diamond cutters that we read about . . . to study the problems for a time to decide how to break them up into pieces that can be handled." Never before, however, does Dr. Jessup, another councilor to effect, has a new member of interest appeared so suddenly. "The big problem," goes still another, "is something we call the 'soft CIA'. That is, how do you find out how the CIA Government is living up to the terms of the agreement?" And, we want to know how an atomic armament agreement might affect international and domestic law and the American Constitution fit should be junked, of course!"

We have been hearing for some time of the frantic search for "projects" on which to spend the enormous sums now available for academic research. The news from Columbia is, therefore, reassuring. This project has not come from nowhere save the bottom of the barrel; there is very little left.

Also with Allard has been inspired by his genius, we mourn the death of Arturo Toscanini. Next week, Mr. Schlesinger will write an appreciation of the Maestro in his column.